### なるようけ 26° Division of Please promptly return this slip to the Assembly Hearing Slip messenger at the committee. Mean thois Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against: Assembly Sergeant at Arms (Please print plainly) 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708 Neither for nor against: Provided by: Registering in favor: Registering against: 1001001 Speaking in favor: Street Address or Route Number Speaking against: City and Zip Code Representing Subject-Viviendo Coalithm Aponnet Please promptly return this slip to the Assembly Hearing Slip messenger at the committee. Speaking for information only: Noither for nor against: Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708 Representing Domestic (Please print plainly) 23/0 Neither for nor against: Provided by: Registering in favor: Registering against: Speaking in favor: Street Address or Route Number Speaking against: Subject -

# Bill No. CRB 2925 Or Subject City and Zip Coole Speaking in favor: Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against: Or Subject Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against: Or Subject Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against:

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please frint plainly)

Please promptly return this slip to the

messenger at the committee.

Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708

Provided by:

# Assembly Hearing Slip (Please print plainly) ıbject esenting Speaking in favor: Speaking against: Registering in favor: Registering against: Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against: ease promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee. Provided by: Assembly Sergeant at Arms

411 West, State Capitol

Madison, WI 53708

**Assembly Hearing Slip** (Please print plainly) Date: Bill No. Or **Subject** Name Speaking in favor: Speaking against: Registering in favor: Registering against: Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against: Pending minor concerns Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee. Provided by: Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708

Court orders don't always remove the person in a housesmost Action.

Harasmet Actions Covers

Borailant Property not burided by Sweight

Victim of a Staller

I mall But can act a restrance

Bob Judewon - 2 Vague - what threats are

injunctions improvement

Problems neleta to

allows for enchoir of one on the other.

99% of evictories that appear to evenyone i a Unit.

shenjty will do nothing or enct everyone. They don't look at properts. earch in is an oction of returning property to land lad

golumin mounstatum. Liebility on the side

edility on the now of the famelone for Meohol

tanent responsed

Morrio Tatum What is the practice How is propert retherised. Bab Dennele Fights among hereals heighborning tenants borant malle amyone feel

Dogs Roaming

Ylduly Brose

(leep restar Housing Boke



### WISCONSIN REALTORS® ASSOCIATION

4801 Forest Run Road, Suite 201, Madison, WI 53704-7337 608-241-2047 • 800-279-1972

Fax: 608-241-2901 E-mail: wra@wra.org

Web site: http://www.wra.org

## FAX COVER SHEET

				2	_
Please deliver the following page(s):			Pages including cover:		
TO: Martha H.			FROM: TOE M.		
Company:			Company: Wisconsin REALTORS® Association		
Phone:			Phone:		
Fax:			Fax:		
1.47.		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	rax,		
~ . S	2/22/01		and the second		
Date:	/ 2 7 0 1		E-Mail:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	1				
Comments:					
	Martha.				
	polor fac.				w *
www.com		Togránia	The State of the Control of the Cont	e materiale de la companya de la co	.21
	Martha:	va WAS	re: th	e tenno	Salfe
	$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}}$	7			
	1 011	7			**
	60/1				
***.					
If you do not rec	eive all of the pages, or hav	e other problem	e with this fav mlease o	all we at the phone num	her listed above
xx	or we have been or were	o dinor problem	o with this tax, prouse c	WII II II II WO PAVANO MIIII	Dei iisted above.
terrorist PP NOPostable Manual Additional Communications		For Your	Information —		WAI BIT LIFERY BY V
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
<u>Date</u>	Calendar Event	Place	Date_	Calendar Event	<u>Place</u>
April 4	CE 3 & 4 (2001-2002)	Madison	May 21-24	36 Hour Broker	Milwaukee
April 4-5	Buyer Agency (ABR)	Appleton	July 9-12; 16-17	Prelicense Sales	Madison
April 23-24	Quickstrat 3 & 4	Madison	July 26-27	Quickstart 1 & 2	Milwaukee
April 25	CE 1 & 2 (2001-2002)	Madison	August 2-3	Quickstart 3 & 4	Milwaukee
Apr 30, May 1-3; 7-	-10 Prelicense Sales	Madison	August 6-10	GRI Equivalency	Statewide
May 9	Realtor & Govt Day	Madison	August 13-14	Quickstart 1 & 2	Madison
	1		' August 27-28	Quickstart 3 & 4	Madison

### LRP-2925/P3

This legislation attempts to provide additional grounds for a landlord to use as a basis for simply giving a tenant a 5-day notice to quit the premises. These additional grounds have been inserted in the statute, which is now used for situations when law enforcement agencies give landlords notice that there is drug or criminal gang activity on the premises. In these cases we have a third party – the law enforcement agency – making the determination that the tenant has committed some act that would warrant the landlord terminating the tenancy.

There seem to be three categories of additional circumstances where the landlord is to be given this power:

1. If a cop comes to the beer party and issues a citation: if the tenant received a citation from a law enforcement officer for a violation of Wis. Stat. § 125.04(1) for an act that occurred in the rental unit or property. Wis. Stat. § 125.04(1) provides: "License or permit; when required. No person may sell, manufacture, rectify, brew or engage in any other activity for which this chapter provides a license, permit, or other type of authorization without holding the appropriate license, permit or authorization issued under this chapter."

This would seem to potentially cover a broad range of activities. If they have a party and the cops come and issue a citation, the landlord can get the tenant out with a 5-day notice, no second chances.

How does the landlord know that there is a citation and how does he or she prove it if the tenant challenges in court?

2. <u>Landlord seeks an injunction against one tenant who is harassing another tenant</u>. Why should the landlord undertake this responsibility? Might this create a new duty for landlords to seek injunctions every time a tenant says they are being harassed or threatened? We assume that the intent is to help protect landlords from liability, but might it not have the opposite effect?

Add language that states that this statute does not create a duty for property owners to seek an injunction on behalf of third parties.

3. <u>Tenant has injunction against another tenant</u>. This may be based upon domestic abuse, child abuse, harassment of a vulnerable adult (elderly, frail, disabled, etc.), or harassment.

In all of these cases, an attempt is made to have an authority such as the police or a judge make the determination that the tenant has misbehaved. The drinking citation or the harassment injunction is intended to be the objective proof. This is better than asking a landlord to make this judgment him or herself – too much room for abuse.

<u>Grammatical confusion</u>. On page 2, line 6; page 3, line 8; and page 4, line 8 the punctuation may be in need of attention. It is confusing as to whether the landlord gives the tenant the five-day notice only if one tenant has an injunction against another tenant, or in all of the circumstances listed beforehand. We obviously know what is intended but wonder does the statute need to be restructured or reorganized to eliminate any possible confusion or misunderstanding.

Vied this change July 23, 2001

Testimony on LRB 2925 Assembly Housing Committee

TO: Housing Committee Members

FROM: Patti Seger, Policy Development Coordinator, Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence

The Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence (WCADV) is a statewide membership organization of battered women, formerly battered women, domestic abuse programs and individuals committed to ending domestic violence. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you about LRB 2925 today on behalf of the Coalition.

WCADV opposes LRB 2925. Although this bill appears on its face to provide some safety to victims of domestic violence whom are awarded a domestic abuse injunction, there is a high potential for unintended negative consequences to occur should this bill become law. On one level, this bill is unnecessary if its intent is to remove from tenancy any person against whom another tenant has a restraining order. The issuance of the restraining order will already guarantee that the respondent to the order can no longer reside in the residence with the alleged victim. Despite what appears to be a duplicitous law in this regard, it is the many unintended consequences that could result from passage of this law that is cause for opposition.

Many domestic violence victims choose to seek a restraining order to terminate violent relationships. Many others do not seek this relief for reasons that are uniquely their own. Victims of abuse should be allowed to determine the best and safest way and time to end the relationship. Intervention can sometimes escalate violence rather than end it. This bill will allow landlords to seek restraining orders against the abusive partner if the victim of the abuse does not choose this recourse. Unfortunately, we have all come to recognize that the presence of a restraining order does not end the violence, particularly if the abusing party is not law-abiding or feels above-the-law. Having a restraining order and subsequent eviction imposed could cause some batterers to escalate rapidly and may lead to even further violence.

Additionally, landlords may file injunctions against the victims themselves, either because the victim will not willfully terminate the relationship or because the abuser may stalk the victim at the residence once the relationship has ended. Some landlords may see the victim as part of the problem and may believe that the victim's continued tenancy endangers the other residents. We recognize that this is not the intent of this proposed



law, however, experience has repeatedly demonstrated that society still holds victims of domestic violence responsible for the abusive conduct of their partners. The termination of tenancy of a victim of abuse would be particularly agregious, especially for women living in poverty or women of color. Landlords in some communities are already reluctant to rent to poor women or people of color. They will be even more reluctant to rent to a victim of domestic violence who has been evicted from her last apartment. When this happens, the obstacles for these women to overcome are multiplied.

Thank you once again for considering my comments on behalf of WCADV today.

21. A